

New Mexico - Gallup Field Office
FY 2003 Ranking Criteria Worksheet - WATER RESOURCES

Applicant _____ Farm No. _____ Tract No. _____ CMS Field No's. _____ Date _____
 Tribal Land _____ Non-Tribal Land _____ Preliminary Rating _____ Final Rating _____

1. Water Quality - Potential Points 140 (23.1%)

Irrigation Efficiency - Use FIRS to Evaluate			Potential Points	Benchmark Points	After Points
% Efficiency	% of Area in Contract before Treatment	% of Area in Contract After Treatment			
1-20%			0		
21-30%			20		
31-40%			40		
41-50%			60		
51-60%			80		
61-70%			100		
71-80%			120		
>80%			140		
1. Water Quantity			Total		

2. Water Quality - Potential Points 120 (19.9%)

A. Surface Water Pollutants - 40 Points

There is a probability that irrigation water containing salt, pesticides, and/or nutrients (or other associated chemicals) is leaching into the ground water. Treatment is needed to prevent these pollutants from contaminating ground water, through leaching.

Distance of Surface Run-Off to Live Water	Points		After
<100 Ft.	40		
101 - 500 Ft.	30		
501 - 1,320 Ft.	20		
1,320 - 2,640 Ft.	10		
>2,640 Ft.	5		
No Runoff	0		
A. Surface Water		Total	

B. Ground Water Pollutants - 80 Points

There is a probability that irrigation water containing salt, pesticides, and/or nutrients (or other associated chemicals) is leaching into the ground water. Treatment is needed to prevent these pollutants from contaminating ground water, through leaching and direct return flow into wells. Points to be awarded based on depth of well.

Depth to Water Table	Points		After
1 - 10 Ft or elimination of any direct discharge into ground water.	80		
10 - 50 Ft.	60		
50 -100 Ft.	40		
>100 Ft.	20		
B. Ground Water		Total	

New Mexico - Gallup Field Office
FY 2003 Ranking Criteria Worksheet - WATER RESOURCES

Applicant _____ Farm No. _____ Tract No. _____ CMS Field No's. _____ Date _____
Tribal Land _____ Non-Tribal Land _____ Preliminary Rating _____ Final Rating _____

3. Selected Conservation Practice(s) - Potential Points 265 (43.8%)

Practices used in this section of the ranking criteria, and intended to be included in the conservation plan of operations, must be cost shared. Higher priority (value) is given to those practices which address multiple resource concerns, are cost effective, and have longer life spans. Practices in this section are grouped, one or all practices may be used.	Potential Points	Percent of Need - To be Installed	Points
Water Quality			
IRRIGATION WATER CONVEYANCE PRACTICES: 428A,430CC,430DD,430EE,430II,430JJ,441,442,587 (3 PTS. EA.)	27		
WATER CONSERVATION PRACTICES: 442,464,466 (3 PTS. EA.)	9		
RIPARIAN AREA ENHANCEMENT PRACTICES: 391,580,657 (2 PTS. EA.)	6		
EROSION CONTROL PRACTICES: 329A,329B,329C,380,382,512,650 (2 PTS. EA.)	14		
Air			
IRRIGATION WATER CONVEYANCE PRACTICES: 428A,430CC,430DD,430EE,430II,430JJ,441,442,587 (3 PTS. EA.)	27		
WATER CONSERVATION PRACTICES: 442,464,466 (3 PTS. EA.)	9		
EROSION CONTROL PRACTICES: 329A,329B,329C,380,382,512,650 (2 PTS. EA.)	14		
Animals			
EROSION CONTROL PRACTICES: 329A,329B,329C,380,512,650 (2 PTS. EA.)	14		
WILDLIFE PRACTICES: 516,614,648 (1 PT. EA.)	3		
RIPARIAN AREA ENHANCEMENT PRACTICES: 391,580,657 (2 PTS. EA.)	6		
SOIL EROSION			
IRRIGATION WATER CONVEYANCE PRACTICES: 428A,430CC,430DD,430EE,430II,430JJ,441,442,587 (3 PTS. EA.)	27		
WATER CONSERVATION PRACTICES: 442,464,466 (3 PTS. EA.)	9		
EROSION CONTROL PRACTICES: 329A,329B,329C,380,382,512,650 (2 PTS. EA.)	14		
WATER QUANTITY			
IRRIGATION WATER CONVEYANCE PRACTICES: 428A,430CC,430DD,430EE,430II,430JJ,441,442,587 (3 PTS. EA.)	27		
WILDLIFE PRACTICES: 516,614,648 (1 PT. EA.)	3		
PLANTS			
IRRIGATION WATER CONVEYANCE PRACTICES: 428A,430CC,430DD,430EE,430II,430JJ,441,442,587 (3 PTS. EA.)	27		
WATER CONSERVATION PRACTICES: 442,464,466 (3 PTS. EA.)	9		
RIPARIAN AREA ENHANCEMENT PRACTICES: 391,580,657 (2 PTS. EA.)	6		
EROSION CONTROL PRACTICES: 329A,329B,329C,380,382,512,650 (2 PTS. EA.)	14		
3. Selected Conservation Practices	Total		

New Mexico - Gallup Field Office
FY 2003 Ranking Criteria Worksheet - WATER RESOURCES

Applicant _____ Farm No. _____ Tract No. _____ CMS Field No's. _____ Date _____

Tribal Land Non-Tribal Land Preliminary Rating Final Rating

4. Other Considerations - Potential Points 80 (13.2%)

Below are some suggested, not required, criteria. If there are other criteria the D.C. wants to recommend based on LWG advice, please include them here.	Potential Points		After Points
A. Threatened and Endangered species are in the area and the contract will enhance habitat for the species.	15		
B. Treatment of this land could have a beneficial impact on a 303d listed stream segment.	20		
C. Treatment of this land enhances the benefits of an active sec. 319 project or the land is located within a proposed sec. 319 project area.	10		
D. Riparian areas will be enhanced in the contracted area.	25		
E. Eradicate/prevent infestation of Class A and/or B noxious weeds as designated by NMDA.	10		
4. Other Considerations	Total		

Designated Conservationist _____ Date _____ Producer _____ Date _____